UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,608	11/12/2004	Leif Nilsson	SZAC.P0101US	7839
	7590 10/30/200 KLAR (SOER)	EXAMINER		
RENNER, OTT	O, BOISSELLE & SK	KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K		
1621 EUCLID AVENUE 19TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CLEVELAND,	OH 44115	2629		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/509,608	NILSSON ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	SKILAKSHIVII K. KUWAK	2029	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addi	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 October 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejectio FFIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the size forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The approprianally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con		ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	**		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ie issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reig	ected claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11		otou olamio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane / mioriamone (i	102 02 1).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allo		timely filed amendmen	t canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	,		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-16 and 20</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attache	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Srilakshmi K Kumar/		
	Primary Examiner		
	Art Unit: 2629		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: With respect to the proposed new claims 21-23, Examiner requires further search and consideration as they raise new issues. Applicant argues where the prior art of Bower teaches in paragraph 0043 describes a separate button and a double click, and where the present invetion does not require a separate button. Examiner contends whether a separate button is present or not, Bower teaches the feature of placing the finger on the device, removing the finger and replacing the finger as claimed in the applicant's invention. Applicant argues where AAPA does not disclose navigating by solely performing the two steps within a set time limit. AAPA teaches a hierarchical menu, not the performing the two steps within a set time limit which is taught by Bower. Applicant argues that the prior art of Wallace does not disclose a movable physical member, examiner, respectfully disagrees. Wallace teaches movement and movement sensors in Fig. 2. With respect to applicant's arguments of where the prior art of record doesn't teach the feature of "the triggering even for starting the timer is an upward movement, as this limitation is a new limitation which is not enter, this argument will not be considered. Applicant argues where the prior art of Wallace and Bower are not compatible since a button is to be added to Wallace so that a double click can be performed. Examiner, respectfully, disagrees. As is well known in the art a button is not needed for double click action. This double click can be performed on a touch pad with no buttons. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.